	1
1	COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON
2	
3	
4	
5	HELD:
6	
7	
8	Tuesday, March 9th, 2021
9	
10	
11	
12	LOCATION:
13	VIA ZOOM
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
2324	Maria McCool, RPR
25	Official Court Reporter
۷)	official court Reporter
L	

		2
1	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	
2		
3	WILLIAM GAUGHAN, PRESIDENT	
4	KYLE DONAHUE, VICE PRESIDENT	
5	MARK MCANDREW	
6	JESSICA ROTHCHILD - absent	
7	THOMAS SCHUSTER	
8		
9	LORI REED, CITY CLERK	
10	KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK	
11	KEVIN HAYES, COUNCIL SOLICITOR	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

MR. GAUGHAN: Would everyone please remain standing for a moment of silent reflection for our service men and women throughout the world and also for those who have passed away in our community.

I'd like to also take a moment of silence tonight for all of the people in our community, in our country and around the world who have passed away from the coronavirus.

This pandemic has turned our world upside down. But we must remain hopeful and strong. We continue to pray for the doctors, the nurses, the researchers and all medical professionals who seek to heal and help those affected and who put themselves at risk in the process, may they have protection and peace.

Whether we are home or abroad, surrounded by many people suffering from this illness or only a few, let us stick together, endure together, mourn together and in place of our anxiety let us have hope and peace. Thank you. Roll call, please.

MS CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.

	4
1	MR. SCHUSTER: Present.
2	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew.
3	MR. MCANDREW: Present.
4	MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild. Mr.
5	Donahue.
6	MR. DONAHUE: Here.
7	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
8	MR. GAUGHAN: Here.
9	MR. MCANDREW: Okay. I would like
10	to make a quick motion to appoint Councilman
11	Donahue as temporary Chair for the Committee of
12	Community Development.
13	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
14	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
15	those in favor signify by saying aye.
16	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
17	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
18	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
19	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
20	ayes have it and so moved. Please dispense
21	with the reading of the minutes.
22	MS. REED: Thank you. THIRD ORDER.
23	3-A. CITY OF SCRANTON INDEPENDENT AUDITORS'
24	REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DATED DECEMBER
25	31, 2019 PREPARED BY KOHANSKI COMPANY

PC. 1 Independent Auditor's Financial Report dated 12-31-2019. 2 3 3-B. OVERTIME REVIEW FOR ALL 4 DEPARTMENTS AS PROVIDED BY CITY 5 CONTROLLER DATED MARCH 3, 2021 FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 2021. 6 3-C. MINUTES OF THE SCRANTON 7 8 REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REGULAR MEETING 9 HELD JANUARY 6, 2021. 10 3 - D. MINUTES APPROVED MARCH 3, 2021 FOR THE SCRANTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY 11 SPECIAL ANNUAL MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 5, 2020. 12 MINUTES OF THE CIVIL SERVICE 13 3-E. 14 COMMISSION MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 4, 2021. 15 MR. GAUGHAN: Are there any comments 16 on any of the Third Order items? I have a few 17 comments on the overtime report that I'd like 18 some answers to from the administration for 19 next week if possible. 20 So one of the things that I brought 21 up last year towards the end of the year was 22 the fact that we did not have any money 23 budgeted in the overtime category for the Law 24 Department. Yet there was money that was 25 expended for overtime.

This year for the 2021 budget we did
not have any overtime budgeted. Yet money is
being spent on overtime. So, you know, it's
always been my understanding -- and I looked
back at the last few budgets from 2015 and

there in the line item.

So, you know, when Council approves a budget and we put a zero in the line item, then I expect that unless there's an extraordinary circumstance that there's going to be no money spent because there's no money

2019, there was never any money budgeted for

overtime and there was never any money spent.

So it wasn't a lot of money that was spent. But I just want to make sure that this is not a recurring issue. Otherwise, if we felt it was necessary we would have put that money in there. Also, I do have a concern the -- we've spent now \$116,557.16 on overtime in the police department just in the month of January alone.

So far according to Controller

Murray's report, we spent about a quarter of
our budget. So I just want to know if, you
know, there's a reason behind that if there's

retirements or what's going on there.

And then the last point I'd like to make on that DPW administration that there was \$2,250 that was budgeted. We've spent \$2,700.83. Now, I'm assuming that's because of a snowstorm. However, I looked at previous budgets again from 2015 to 2019, there was never any money budgeted for DPW administration overtime.

And there was never any money spent. Or if there was, it was in the area of 20 to 30 dollars. So I would like to know if there's some kind of new policy now that we're giving supervisors overtime and why we're spending that much money on overtime in the -- that administration line item and what has changed from the, you know, past five or six years.

So, Mrs. Reed, if you could check in with the Business Administrator on that, that would be very helpful. And that's all I have. Does anyone have any comments on the Third Order items? If not, received and filed. Do any Council members have any announcements at this time?

I have a few. Just to give

everybody an update on the next two or three weeks in terms of people who are coming to give presentations at our caucus meetings, so next week, March 16th, we are going to have a public hearing at 5:45 regarding the denial of the application that went in front of the Historical Architectural Review Board, the HARB. That was resolution 120 of 2021.

So that will be a public hearing next week. And we'll have that -- those people come in and state their case. And I think that there was a certified mail that went out to them to notify them.

After that public hearing we'll have Stephen Oselinski from the Pennsylvania American Water Company come in and give us an update on the upcoming water projects. And then in Fourth Order we're going to have Don King, the City Planner and Joe -- potentially Joe O'Brien the City Solicitor come in and talk to us about a piece that's on our agenda tonight which is the Meadow Brook Sponsorship Agreement with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.

We'll also have Carl Deeley our

Business Administrator along with the Chief of Police come in and talk about the Open Gov contract that's going to be coming down next week regarding some movement in the IT

Department to update our operating platform and also to talk about the other -- there's two agenda items in Fifth Order regarding the upgrades to the Serrenti Center.

On March 23rd we have a public hearing at 5:45 for the OECD caper. In Fourth Order, we have a tentative -- this is tentative at this point, an exit conference with the auditor Kohanski Company and the Business Administrator Carl Deeley regarding the 2019 audit.

And then on March 30th, Director
Cipriani at 5:45 and MKSD, the company who is
here tonight is going to talk about the draft
study at Nay Aug Pool, the feasibility study
that's being done. So they'll come for a
second round. So that takes us out to March
30th. Anyone else have any announcements?
Okay. Very good. Mrs. Reed.

MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS PARTICIPATION.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. We're going now to talk about the Nay Aug Pool feasibility study. So we have quite a few people with us here tonight. Many of them I think are representatives from MKSD. So just for the sake of the public, I'd like to go around the room if you don't mind the gentlemen who are here from MKSD if you don't mind introducing yourselves really quick.

MR. CHAMBERS: Certainly. Good evening everyone. My name is Todd Chambers.

I'm with MKSD Architects. With me tonight, I have Nick Hewes from MKSD.

MR. HEWES: Hello everybody.

MR. CHAMBERS: And George Deines who is with Counsilman Hunsaker. And Counsilman Hunsaker is an aquatics consulting firm. I think George is based out of Dallas. But we work with them to complete many studies across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania very similar to the one that we're performing for the City of Scranton that we'll be talking about this evening.

So if you would like to do more introductions or, Nick and George, do you have

anything to say?

MR. HEWES: I'd just like to introduce myself. Again, Nick Hewes, I'm one of the architects. It's great meeting everybody and a pleasure working with our committee, the pool committee here. Many of the members are with us today, Eileen and Paul and Bob. And I said George is with us so happy to be here with you guys.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Thank you.

And we also have Director Cipriani who has been with us before quite a few times, does a great job as the Executive Director of OECD. We also have Brian Fallon who is the Director of Parks and Recreation who again I think is a friend to all of us and does a wonderful job in that department, running that department. Bob Gattens who is the -- you're the chairman, right, still Bob of the recreation --

MR. GATTENS: That's correct.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay, Bob is the
Chairman of the Recreation Authority. And we
have Paul Kelly here who is the Solicitor for
the Recreation Authority. So thank you all for
being here. I'll now turn it over to you

gentlemen and other representatives of the City to walk us through this feasibility study that we have in front of us. And feel free to share your screen if you need to.

MR. HEWES: Thank you. I'll start out, we've begun a study, had multiple conversations with our committee and just going through the needs and wants, what the desire is as we proceed with a full feasibility study of what can be done, if anything, with the existing pool facilities.

And then we have recently proceeded with an on-site survey of the facilities, the pump house, the bath house and the existing pools. And then from there I developed a report of that site visit which I believe you all should have received today, I believe, if not yesterday.

And from there, as we proceed further we'll be continuing the study of developing our thoughts, getting drawings and options together and to give you a full report of what can be done and different options if you go with a revised or a repair, a renovating or replace options for this facility.

It will include financial information, budgetary information and different aquatic (inaudible) that could essentially or potentially be introduced into this facility. We'll go over those as well tonight.

But I would like to turn the floor over to George who as Todd mentioned is our aquatics consultant. And he'll be able to walk you through this what we've found so far on site and also the aquatic trends.

MR. DEINES: My name is George

Deines. And I'm with Counsilman□Hunsaker and
we do the aquatic facility planning and design.
As Todd mentioned I'm teamed with him and Nick
on numerous projects across the state of
Pennsylvania.

So I guess a couple of things we'd like to do is first off was the report that we shared earlier today. We were on site just last Monday and walked the site and got a feel for the current condition of the pool and the pool mechanical system.

And so if you haven't had a chance to read through all the report, essentially

what we found is that just given the condition of the structure of the existing slide pool that we would not recommend trying to renovate that pool in its current form to try to use again, you know, it did have a liner that was ripped out, you know, the season before last or earlier this year.

And what we found underneath the liner was that the plaster that -- the plaster pool surfaces completely delaminated in several areas of the pool. And you could see that in some of the photos at the end of the report. It essentially looks like gravel and just chunks of rock underneath the pool liner.

And the last season that you opened, you know, there were complaints from the pool guests that they could actually feel that underneath the membrane of the liner. When we start to look at, you know, the expected lifespan for an outdoor pool, you know, typically being in that 30 to 40 year range.

We look at the existing condition of not only the pool shell but also where the gutter meets the pool walls and there's chunks of concrete and tile that you could really just

pick out and pull the pieces of rock out.

And we take into the consideration the fact that the mechanical system has never undergone a renovation. And so a lot of the, you know, original components of that, the filter, the cast iron piping (inaudible) the strainer basket of the mechanic room are showing significant signs of corrosion that we would recommend for the slide pool that, you know, you go ahead and start over.

There's a couple different options that we detailed in the report in terms of, you know, any used pieces of the existing shell whether you build a pool within a pool which is something that our firm has designed before or you could break up the existing pool shell and then build a pool over that.

So there are a couple of options to consider there. And those are some of the things that we will explore over the next few weeks and then present back on March the 30th in terms of what is the right size for the existing pool.

Do you need, you know, 9,000 to 12,000 square foot single pool or do you need a

couple of smaller pools. We could see reusing the existing slide tower in its existing location if we went ahead and designed a new pool with a slide catch area right beneath that.

So there are a lot of options on the table that we're excited about exploring and we'll be excited to share those in the coming weeks. So with that, what I would like to do is maybe just stop down for a minute and if you have any questions on the pool or Nick or Todd are here. They could speak more to the slide and the bathhouse.

We could do that. And we have a couple of slides that we would like to briefly run through as well.

MR. GAUGHAN: So I have a question on the slide. The slide is in okay condition?

MR. DEINES: Correct, yeah. We did not see any -- you know, there's a couple things that we looked for in terms of significant corrosion on the slide tower. We look for, you know, cracks where the fiberglass pieces of the slide have come apart.

But in talking with Bob, you know,

- -

they did not observe any, you know, visible leaks the last time that the slide was running. And so without having, you know, an actual slide manufacturer come out and give a full assessment of the slide, we do feel it's something that could be reused just based upon the physical inspection that we did.

MR. GAUGHAN: In your estimation, do you think it's possible that this pool will be -- Nay Aug Park Pool will be open by this summer?

MR. DEINES: I would think that that would not be possible just given the limited window that you have from now until, you know, Memorial Day or even if you pushed it out to June 15th, the amount of work that would need to be done, you know, to get it up and operational, you know, we would have to --you'd have to have a contractor tear off, you know, all of the plaster surface that you would have to repair the concrete, you know, in the areas that it's failed.

You would also then have to either paint that surface or install a new liner over that, you know, plus with, you know, having not

run the mechanical system in two seasons or, you know, it's been since the 2019 season since it's been running. I feel that that would be extremely difficult to get the pool open for this coming season.

MR. GAUGHAN: And there's -- so there's no way that, you know, you can -- I'm just thinking, you know, my concern is that, you know, the pool doesn't open this summer -- well, first of all, we're going to be coming hopefully out of the pandemic.

and really around the City are going to want to get out and families are going to want to get out and get to the recreation areas, especially this is one of our biggest assets. So my concern is that you don't have this pool opened, these kids are going to go to the gorge.

They're going to go other places.

Is there any way that you can put some temporary fixes on it and open it with the goal of, you know, after the summer season is over moving towards a complete overhaul or is that not possible either?

2 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DEINES: I think that could be possible if you -- you know, would strip down the pool plaster and then reinstall a brand new liner all the way across the pool structure. But, you know, in its current state and even talking with Bob last week, you know, the liner company would not warranty the installation of the liner just because of the condition of the pool.

And I think that just seeing the number of gaps that are around the perimeter of the pool beneath the gutter and the pool shell that that could be, you know, it's cause for concern that you could lose a massive amount of water during the summer season if, you know, the liner isn't perfectly installed and, you know, there's ways for the water to get back behind there.

And then when it gets back behind the liner then it bubbles up as you could see on the, you know, the deeper pool right now. And the same thing happened on the slide pool the last time it was operational.

MR. HEWES: In addition to that just so I could add, there's also the issue of all

around the deck the concrete sidewalk and deck around the pool itself has some significant cracking and heating. That would not pass inspection without some repairs to that.

So this would all be part of the overall repairs but, I mean, in your question regarding, you know, can something be temporarily done, I'm not sure or, you know, short of something, you know, ripping off big chunks of that deck and fully completely replacing it just to get something temporarily in, you know, I'm not sure that you would be able to pass inspection as it is now for sure.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. One of the questions I have too is the -- I'm up there a lot with my kids walking around when the weather is nice because the park is beautiful obviously. But the other pool that the -- I think the plan was eventually to fill that in. Do we know or have any idea when that's going to be done?

My concern with that is if you get a young child or teenager that, you know, jumps that fence at night especially and falls in there, that's like a 13 to 14-foot drop. So is

there any plans to fill that in in the near future?

MS. CIPRIANI: Councilman Gaughan, I could address that. We're preparing a bid proposal that is out on the street right now for demolition. And that is part of the package. So right now we're trying to figure out how much it will cost.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Great. Great.

I have other questions. But I don't want to hold up the presentation. I know you have more to present here. Does anyone else from Council have any questions while we stop here at this spot?

MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, President

Gaughan, so when we're looking at this

presentation right now we're just discussing

the other pool. The scope of this

presentation, does it just cover the shallow or

slide pool or is it both pools included in this

presentation?

MR. HEWES: Well, today we're going over like I just did our findings of the existing facility. The intent I believe of the study and the committee has always represented

that the deeper pool is -- the idea is to be demolished and filled in and a different either aquatic facility like a spray pad or something would be an option to go in that location.

But the presentation other than that tonight is to go over various options of what's available as we move forward in our study to see what can be put in where the slide pool is now and other amenities around it. But the other pool, the deeper pool the idea was to get rid of that.

MR. SCHUSTER: Okay. So this is just covering the shallower slide pool. And then when we're talking about the pool house, are we talking about -- the picture that we're looking at here, there's the building that we could see in the picture. But there is also a pool house that is off of -- that's out of frame on this photo here towards the end of the deeper pool?

MR. HEWES: Yeah, that would be the pump house that houses all the equipment. So given the -- there's electrical equipment within that that shows corrosion just because of the chemicals that are stored within it and

the existing conditions how they're all original, a lot of that building, you know, needs some good work -- good repairs to it.

As we move forward with the project, we would once -- if this becomes an actual project and, you know, we move ahead with complete, you know, renovations and things based on the new equipment that would be needed, we would evaluate -- either if we could reuse part of that building, great.

But from what it looks like now, we probably want to locate something in that location and possible at another end of the property to accommodate the new equipment. But as it stands now, that pump house is not really very -- in very good shape. And as far as the bathhouse is concerned, the committee has let us know that, you know, there's a need for that to be much larger.

Right now it's basically just two toilet rooms. There's really not any lockers or places for people to change. There are a couple showers in there. But like they mentioned, if there is a rainstorm that comes, you know, everyone on the pool deck tries to

run inside that space and it's not really large enough to accommodate that. So we would also look at that as part of the study.

MR. SCHUSTER: Okay, yeah. So we're talking about that pump house that is out of frame. I'm just making sure that it's clear to Council and then everybody at home watching that -- what buildings there we're talking about. Now, this pool was built in 1966. Was that other pool, the deeper pool, was also the same year?

ATTY. KELLY: Yeah.

MR. SCHUSTER: How about the bathhouse and the slides, what year -- just so it's fresh in everybody's mind, what year were they from?

ATTY. KELLY: '08, '07, I think the slides, yeah, around there -- approximately 15 years, Councilman.

MR. SCHUSTER: All right. Thank you.

MR. MCANDREW: I have a quick question. I don't know if I should pose it to George or just the team here. So I looked at the assessment. And it is an assessment with

options.

I looked at the options. I would like a recommendation. I mean, is it cheaper to repair or replace at this point? I mean, do we pull the Band-Aid off and say, you know what, let's just replace it because from what I looked at and what you said already, it sounds it's in horrible shape to just repair.

So I want to know what your recommendations are based on your findings outside of the options, repair or replace?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah, our final report will, you know, provide options usually to repair, renovate or replace. I don't think repair is really too great of an option for this pool unfortunately.

So you will see renovate and replace options in the study, you know, as the final results of the study and that would be financial data to support those and help you make a decision. And we will, of course, provide a recommendation one way or the other based on what we get from the public and from the committee as well.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. You guys could

continue with your presentation. Thank you.

MR. MCANDREW: Oh, I'm sorry. I just want to know, you know, time's our enemy. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to get smart. So you're saying you're going to come back. So what does that look like?

MR. CHAMBERS: So usually our process is that we meet with the public and get some input. And we have a few committee meetings and we formulate some options. And then we bring it back to the public and to Council to review the results that come out of the public meetings.

ATTY. KELLY: And I think it might be wise to alert Council as to what the timetable is on these studies. This is basically just the first part of the facility. Why don't you, Eileen, if you would, why don't you update Council on what we need to get to a final study.

MS. CIPRIANI: So what we're doing is we're following the checklist and timeline that DCNR puts into all of their pregrant applications. DCNR requires a feasibility study for any grant. The next grant round

closes in the middle of April. So this study will be completed prior to that.

So it will be able to inform that grant application. So part of this study and that's why we're here tonight to seek your input and we need to open up a period of public comment. We actually have two studies there up on the website tonight that people could go on and give their input. But that's a vital piece of this that DCNR looks for in advance of their grants.

MR. CHAMBERS: Correct. There's surveys that are on the website and we're meeting -- we're giving a presentation at the Mayor's --

ATTY. KELLY: Town hall.

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, correct, town hall. Thank you.

ATTY. KELLY: On Friday.

MS. CIPRIANI: But, Councilman

McAndrew, that -- the idea that at the -- on

the 30th they will come back to us with their

recommendations and costs and that will be able

to feed our grant application. So, you know, a

decision could be rendered. And we could

figure out what way to go and what to apply for.

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, typically on the 30th we come back with a draft report and review that with Council and then we would finalize that draft into a final report after that meeting with Council. George, do you want to run through the rest of your slide deck?

MR. DEINES: Sure thing. What we essentially discussed was our process line that we have here. So that was a good segue. So our goal in teaming with MKSD is to provide you all with, you know, good solid data and information regarding the Nay Aug Park Pool and for you guys to use that to make a knowledgeable decision on how best to move forward about the continued operation of the facility into the future.

And so as Todd mentioned, we'll come back here in a few weeks with several different options to explore obviously comparing that, you know, what does, you know, we input 1.65 million dollars in our report is the cost to repair to get it operational.

But that really doesn't buy you that

much more time. And you still have the same functional facility. It is not functioning differently than it does now. You know, it's a brand new 1966 pool. And so what we want to make sure that we do is provide you with some other options as well.

When we look at the aquatic user groups, we typically classify those in four different sections between recreation, competition, instruction as well as wellness and therapy. When you're looking at the outdoor seasonal aquatics, you know, it's a vital part of any community.

We find that recreation is going to generate probably 75 to 80 percent of the uses of those types of facilities. You know, in terms of today's amenities, we're seeing things like zero depth entries and children's play structures that could be themed or they can really be any shape and size.

We find that vertical water sprays are very popular to incorporate for the young ones. Open water recreation area is also very popular as well as these types of walkable, floatable activities. You know, it's great to

get kids active and healthy and give them a challenge.

We find that, you know, there's some different types of moving water that we could incorporate. You know, here's a couple of examples of maybe a current channel which is, you know, typically a little bit smaller than a lazy river that you might see at a, you know, true commercial water park.

You know, incorporating lap lanes for the competitive side or even just the fitness side. But then those lap lanes can also double for general recreation. You know, you see this lap pool here has a climbing wall as well as a diving board.

On the other end you have a water basketball goal that can be used. Climbing walls are something -- we have replaced some diving boards here the last few years. We still find diving is a really popular amenity. And now that the industry and the codes have gotten the depths and slopes worked out, we really don't see that, you know, it's a huge liability concern.

And so we could definitely look at a

climbing wall or a diving board. Here you have, you know, something that is a natural rock scape that has a diving platform. It has a climbing wall as well as a water slide for some deep water recreation. And then we also like to couple that with water slides of all types and sizes.

You all have slides now that I'm assuming you probably have a 48 inch height requirement. And so not all the kids can ride those. So, you know, some of these slides here are for, you know, ages two to seven until they hit that 48 inch height requirement.

And so we could explore, you know, a variety of water slides whether they are open or closed. Maybe they end in the water, maybe they end in the deck in a fiberglass runoff.

So those are some of the different options in terms of recreation that we'll explore.

When we look at competition, you know, that is essentially dictated by the fact, you know, you have, you know, summer swim teams that would be interested in using the pool.

That might help you decide you want six lanes, eight lanes or you could go back to a 50 meter

pool.

But what we want to do is we want to make sure that we couple that or multipurpose that water so that it's not just lap lanes that it also serves as a good capacity holder for open water recreation. Obviously, you know, the importance of swimming lessons and summer seasonal aquatics is one of the first ways that the majority of kids get introduced to the water.

So being able to have, you know, shallow water that's 2 and a half to 3 and a half feet deep, maybe a teaching ledge like you see here is always vital to teach kids how to swim and then lastly, wellness and therapy opportunities. And the picture you see here I like to show because it's a six-lane lap pool.

But it actually has several different purposes. So in the first lane there was general open lap swim. In the second lane, you'll see an instructor over here teaching a child how to swim. And then there's a special needs water walking class in the shallow area.

And that still leaves open the deep area for, you know, a deep water aerobics class

or another type of activity. So we always like to talk about multi-purposing those spaces of water.

And then lastly what I'd like to show is, you know, just some different pictures of before or after of some facilities that we've designed (audio interruption.)

MR. GAUGHAN: I think your audio went out, George.

MR. DEINES: Oh, no, can you hear me now?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah, we can hear you now.

MR. DEINES: Okay, great. So these are some before and after pictures of pools that are similar to Nay Aug Park Pool in size and layout and condition. And so it just gives you an idea of, you know, some of the different ways that we can take an older style pool and turn it into more of a modern family aquatic center, something that caters to families within the Scranton community.

And then the pictures on the far right there is the one that we teamed with Todd and Nick in Chambersburg. We essentially

followed this exact process. We started out with a pool assessment.

We found that this pool has reached the end of its useful life. And we designed a more modern family aquatic center that, you know, they were really pleased with. So that's a quick minute or two on our study process and some of the different avenues of pool amenities that we'll explore.

And with that, I think we'd like to open it back up to any questions or comments that you have. And we're looking forward to continuing the process, you know, being a part of the Mayor's town hall this Friday as well as pushing out the community survey to get the community's input on what they would like to see at Nay Aug Park.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you for the presentation. We really appreciate it. I have one comment and then two or three questions.

So my first comment looking at all that you presented is that, you know, based on your assessment so far, it doesn't look like it makes any sense to continue to put Band-Aids on the pool.

We'd be throwing good money after bad based on your professional opinion and you guys have been doing this for a long time in other cities. I actually think it's an opportunity to make an investment in the community and in what I think is one of the greatest assets that we have in Scranton in making sure that this pool is going to be here for the next 40 to 50 years or 30 to 40 years, whatever it is.

So I actually think this is an opportunity, an opportunity to do this the right way and to make sure that this is a great recreation area for all of our residents. The one question that I do have for anyone who wants to answer on the committee, I've heard about concerns regarding the pool since spring of last year, even before that about the liner and about the deck and really the whole pool facility.

So is there any reason why it's taken this long to get a company to come in and do an analysis? I mean, I would think last year was the perfect opportunity for us to, you know, really put this on the front burner

rather than the back burner so that there maybe was the potential that we could have the pool open for this summer.

So is there any reason why there wasn't more of a push to put this at the forefront last year when we knew that there was some issues?

ATTY. KELLY: I'll take a stab at answering that, Councilman. This is Paul Kelly. When we realized -- when I say we, the Recreation Authority realized that the pool was failing, we put out an RFP and got a bid -- the most responsible bidder to put a liner in there. And then COVID struck. And I don't want to just keep using COVID as an excuse.

But it really set us back,

Councilman. And no one was even producing

liners to install. It just completely put a

stop sign in everything. And as you -- RFPs

take time. You have to advertise them. They

have to be bid. Bids had to be opened. On top

of that, while we were doing the bid

processing, during 2019 season the bottom

surface of the pool began to bubble.

And that raised great concern for

the Recreation Authority members and for the
City as to whether or not as you said why are
we putting a Band-Aid on a very bad wound here.
Are we wasting money putting a liner over
something one season or two seasons?

And by the way, that was a \$225,000 project just to put that Band-Aid on and not address the decking, the pipes that are corroded, the whole system. We needed -- and through Eileen's efforts and the committee's efforts, we need some help. We need some help with DCNR. We need some help with grants.

And these studies again, we put this out to RFP. MKSD was the most responsible bidder, was awarded the bid. And they're working on a very tight deadline, Councilman Gaughan. You know, we're asking them to complete a study from February to April 12th to comply with DCNR regulations.

So I know that everybody is frustrated. Everybody wants to see children swimming. And having lost the 2020 season and in all likelihood losing the 2021 season, it's upsetting. It's frustrating. But I think we are doing it the right way getting these

studies properly done to give us an idea and give the public an idea what needs to be done up there. That's my two cents. Bob, Eileen, feel free to add to that if I missed anything.

MR. GATTENS: Well, in hindsight I wish we did proceed faster with this. I think we had a year last year where work could have been done and the Recreation Authority and the administration could have met more often and began looking at an earlier stage. But it didn't happen and we're here today.

Maybe because with the virus attention was elsewhere trying to get everything squared away with the City. We're busy trying to get everything squared away in the park. But I feel we dropped the ball on this. It should have been maybe addressed earlier on.

And we wouldn't be up against the wire trying to get a grant and everything. But we are and our goal as the Recreation Authority and I'm sure along with the rest of the team here is to do the best we can at this point here going forward.

MS. CIPRIANI: And, you know, I have

to applaud the Recreation Authority and our vendor really working hard to help us get the data we need to get the application in and not miss DCNR's window. Because we all realize at the end of the day this is going to be a project that needs grant funding because of its high cost. So we appreciate everybody's efforts trying to help us make that deadline.

MR. GAUGHAN: Now, Eileen, at the end of the study it says the -- I know we're going to get more concrete estimates at the end of March. But the preliminary estimate just for repairs to reopen the pool is about over -- a little bit over 1.5 million dollars. So I'm not sure how the DCNR grant is set up. But does that require a match? Would that require a match from the City?

MS. CIPRIANI: Yes. It requires a 50 percent match.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay.

MS. CIPRIANI: You know, we've had some conversations with the Rec Authority and conversations trying to sort out how we would do that. There's also the option and it's not a good option as far as timeline but to do it

__

in phases because I know everybody wants a swimming presence up there as quickly as possible. If we cannot find enough funding, you might have to be a phased project.

MR. GAUGHAN: What about if we thought about it this way because I know it's always risky, you know, you put in a grant application but you don't know if you're going to get it. And I understand what you're saying about phases. I think that's kind of a gamble too.

You know, it could take some time.

What if we looked at other financing options.

I know one of the things we talked about
towards the end of last year was refinancing.

We were looking at refinancing to plug the
hole -- a potential hole for next year. So
maybe putting a capital component on that, is
that a possibility to look at or borrowing?

Could the Recreation Authority, you know, be the borrower and the City could guarantee it or some kind of financing arrangement like that? And I say that because I -- you know, we should go for the grant I agree.

Obviously there's always a risk in that. And this is so important. And it's the biggest asset we have. If we're going to do it, you know, rather than wait and maybe not get the grant or not have the match, you know, I think we should really investigate those options as well.

MS. CIPRIANI: I agree with you.

And we'll take that back to Carl Deeley and the Mayor and, you know, see what we can find, what other options we have. And we're certainly open to suggestions.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah, that might be the -- the borrowing might be the easiest way to fast track it. And again, you'd have to -- you know, this is probably not a conversation for this meeting. But even if you look at whatever the Recreation Authority's finances are.

And, you know, maybe there's an option there. Or, you know, even -- the one thing I was thinking about earlier today was the capital budget. We have a lot of money in there for bridge replacement and the City's match. But that's a few years down the road.

So is there a way that we can take some of those dollars which are earmarked for the bridge replacement match and reallocate them, you know, I don't know. But I think we should look at other avenues and not put all of our eggs in the grant basket just in case it does end coming up short.

MS. CIPRIANI: Certainly.

MR. GAUGHAN: For the gentleman from MKSD, in terms of a perfect world situation which I know we're not in, if everything went the way we wanted it to and you did a full renovation of the pool, how long do those usually take in terms of like a timeline?

MR. CHAMBERS: So we're certainly even up against the clock as we speak right now. In an ideal world we'd finish the study and then, you know, the focus would shift onto immediately creating -- finalizing the design for the project and creating the bid documents for that.

There is a good possibility that if we started construction, you know, sometime late summer, I think it's feasible that, you know, we could have the pool back up and

running for summer of '22, you know, and that could mean, you know, we open on Memorial Day. It could mean we open for 4th of July.

So we'd have to look at the schedule and how the ultimately selected design would schedule out construction -- or design and constructionwise.

MR. GAUGHAN: And that estimate -thank you for that answer. The estimate that
you have at the end of this report, 1.6 million
dollars, that includes the concrete repairs to
the pool structure, paint and surface, new pool
deck, new pool piping, new pool mechanical
system, 20 percent contingency allowance and 10
percent for project fees.

Does that include any of the other designs that you had showed us before in terms of the different structures whether it's -- no, I'm assuming, right?

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't believe it does. But George can answer that.

MR. DEINES: Yeah, that is literally just to repair the existing structure with no added amenities or anything of that sort. So you essentially have the same pool that you

have now.

MR. DONAHUE: So that would be to repair the existing structure. To replace the existing structure would be significantly higher?

MR. DEINES: Correct. And that's what we'll come back with estimates on here in a couple weeks.

MR. GATTENS: George, what's your thoughts and I think we discussed this a little bit. If we did repairs of using a liner, is a liner a favorable item at this time or would we be putting money into a pool to repair it and put a liner on that possibly could be gone in another five or 10 years again?

MR. DEINES: Yeah, so our firm, typically we do not recommend liners, you know, whether it's a PVC type liner. There's even some fiberglass liners, you know, because we essentially see them as a, you know, a Band-Aid because you've had some type of critical failure and you don't have the time or the funds to do a full replacement, you know, within the next say two to five years.

So we really, you know, see that as

a short term investment to just keep the pool operating at minimal level until you can, you know, do a more substantial renovation.

MR. GATTENS: Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Anybody else have any questions?

MR. MCANDREW: I have one quick one. So your renovation examples, were they municipal pools that you did or refurbished or reconstructed or that's just a little candy. It looks like the land of make believe. I mean, is that just a dream option?

We just need a pool whether you pull in a pool or just, you know, that's just a little fluff I think, right, or were they actually municipal pools that you reconfigured to look like that?

MR. CHAMBERS: I was going to say three examples of municipal pools in the State of Pennsylvania that we've completed studies and executed the project for are Hatfield -- and they have a fair amount of the -- what we'll call amenities. I believe they have zero depth entry, a current channel, water slides.

We also did the Perkasie Menlo Park

pool which has very similar amenities. And the most recent one is the Borough of Chambersburg. That has zero depth entry, a play structure, current channel or a lazy river -- top pool, it has the water crossing. It has -- it's soup to nuts.

It has lap lanes, guiding rail. I mentioned the top pool already. There's even a separate spray pad that goes along with that.

So that's kind of like the Cadillac I guess you could call it of public aquatic centers in the State of Pennsylvania.

MR. HEWES: Now that you mention it, that's part of our study the final report that we'll give. We will have options. So we know like you said a spray pad is something that has been, you know, very enthusiastically mentioned by committee as a need instead of multiple bodies of water or, you know, one massive pool to go fill in that -- the deeper pool.

And then we would also provide options what can be done at the those -- the water slide area. Does that become like you said just a pool or, you know, what is the layout that could be done to feature some of

these more exciting amenities that makes -reinvigorates the Nay Aug Park and, you know,
gains an attraction and makes people want to
come back and really utilize this from when
they are, you know, a family with small
children all the way to when they're older kids
and adults, kind of an ageless and timeless
place to go to and enjoy different features.

We'd like to provide all of those things. So that's when it comes to the committee to make choices of what they would want, you know, kind of a menu to choose from, okay, we like this. We like this. And in addition to that, the public feedback which is what we'll try to gain from the surveys that are out and also the town hall meetings.

MR. SCHUSTER: So with that being said, some of those pools that we saw pictures of, I mean, the pool that we're talking about is -- I guess the price tag is plus or minus 1.6 million. Is that just for the pool and a deck alone with a pool house and that? Or are we talking some of those other options you're talking there would be around that same price?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah, so the 1.6

million is just to get the pool operational for a few more years, you know, the based renovations. It does not include any improvements to bathhouse or even the pool mechanical building, just the pool mechanical equipment on the inside.

And so when we come back here in a few weeks, we'll have the capital and the operational implications for, you know, two to three different scenarios. You know, what if we rebuild, you know, an existing a pool similar to the existing pool at Nay Aug Park, you know, you would probably see a little bit of a bump in attendance and overall revenue.

But it's not going to be extreme whereas, you know, what if we spend "X" number of dollars more to include some more family-friendly amenities and as Nick mentioned something that caters to, you know, all ages and what would be the operational and implications of that.

And so what we're going to do is give you that well-rounded look of these are a couple different pool options that we've explored. Here's the capital cost associated

with those. But as well as that, we want to give you the long-term operational cost so you know what the -- you know if there's going to be a subsidy, what that subsidy would be, you know, over the next 15 to 20 years.

MR. SCHUSTER: Now, when we're looking at all of those options, I mean, the last pool that was built in 1966 they said about a 30 to 40-year lifespan. It seems like we got about 55 years out of that pool.

When it comes to these new pools, do they have the same type of lifespan? Do all the amenities that come with them have that same lifespan? Are we going to get 40 to 50 years out of one of these new pools?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah, we typically see, you know, 30-plus year lifespan for an outdoor pool. We also will include a capital replacement, you known, budget line item in our expense estimate. So you know what year, you know, 17 to year 20 that you'll need to renovate the mechanical system and that year nine you need to regel coat the slides and year 15, you know you probably need to replace some of the fading shade structures.

So we'll include estimates like that. But we still would -- we see the pools to have a 30-plus year lifespan.

MR. SCHUSTER: And I'd say probably the more amenities that you have here, the more, you know, sprinklers, the more sprayers, things like that, I mean, the more maintenance obviously you're going to incur with that with links and pipes, different things like that.

Now, another thing when we were talking about the RFP for the deeper pool, the pool that was omitted in that picture, that's a different project all together than what we're talking about here, correct?

MR. CHAMBERS: So we could see in our conceptual plans that we would, you know, include some options of what to do with that area of the facility whether it's a spray pad or whether, you know, that might be converted to park land.

But we could -- that's one of the things that we'll look at is what is the entire footprint needed for the different amenities and the options that we come up with because you have a lot of area, I mean, you know,

20,000 plus square feet of water is huge.

And so it might not be that you need that much area or you could get a lot more grassy area than you have now or like Bob mentioned, you have that spray pad, you know, that takes up a good portion of area where the existing deep pool is.

MR. SCHUSTER: I guess I was kind of referring back to Mrs. Cipriani was saying that an RFP was going to go out for that area. So that would be for what, the filling in and the --

MS. CIPRIANI: Yes, the area we were filling in is part of our demolition RFP that's out right now.

MR. SCHUSTER: Okay, so just the demolition. And another thing when we were talking about maintenance, I mean, the simpler the structure, you know, the simpler the maintenance and less money. When it comes to that DCNR grant, is there max a on that, Mrs. Cipriani?

MS. CIPRIANI: I think the max will end up being our capacity to match it.

MR. SCHUSTER: Okay.

MR. GAUGHAN: And do we now know our capacity to match at this point? I can't remember what we have in the budget.

MS. CIPRIANI: Yeah, I don't know that off the top of my head. That would be a question for Carl.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Any other questions or comments?

MR. GATTENS: Well, I just have one.

I'm going to speak on behalf of the board

itself. I truly think that we need to look at

from end to end in this project and look at

what Mayor Walsh did back in the mid60s, 64,

65, 66. It was basically the same undertaking.

We're taking a pool that was in since the early 1900s and making a huge change. And he had the foresight to do this, him and his administration and Council at the time.

And we gained 55 years out of that project.

I think if we're going to do it, we got to do it the right way. We got to make sure everything is first class that goes in there and not waste money. Like, if we do a land Band-Aid approach to it and everything, I truly feel that we're going to be spending

money time after time again on that complex.

But for the future generations to come if we get 50 more years of enjoyment and entertainment in that park, it's worth every penny of it.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah, I agree with you. I think, you know, obviously this is a challenge. But I think it also presents a really great opportunity for us in the City to invest in. Like I said earlier, I think it's one of the greatest assets that we have in Scranton. And it's that park.

Bob, you know I'm up there all the time with my kids walking around. You know, it's just a huge benefit for the City for that neighborhood but really for the whole entire City. So I think if we do this the right way and if we make a big investment up there, it's going to set the stage not only for that area but really for other development whether it's in the park even in that neighborhood.

So obviously I think we have to be cognizant of our finances in the City. But again, I agree with you, Bob, that we can't continue to put good money after bad and put

_ .

Band-Aids on it.

And I think it's really time to make an investment like Mayor Walsh did so many years ago and make sure that it's something we can all be proud of. So thank you. Anyone else have any questions or comments?

Okay. Thank you everyone. We appreciate it. And we look forward to talking to you again the end of March.

MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you. Have a good night.

MR. HEWES: Thank you.

MR. DEINES: Thank you.

ATTY. KELLY: Stay safe everyone.

MR. GAUGHAN: Bye-bye. Okay,

talking so much about swimming but we can't -the weather's not -- we're not there yet. We
got a sneak peek today what it's going to be
like I think this spring and summer.

Okay. At this time I'd like someone to make a motion to accept public comment from the following individuals: Bev deBarros and Fay Franus.

MR. DONAHUE: I'd like to make a motion to accept public comment.

MR. SCHUSTER: Second.

MR. GAUGHAN: There's been a motion and a second to accept public comment. Mrs. Reed, would you please read the comments into the record?

MS. REED: Thank you. The first submission is from Bev deBarros as follows:

Dear Council ~ regarding our city employees who owe back taxes of course, it will be easy to collect them as their wages from the city can and should be garnished. I doubt, that because of the favors of politics, they will be charged interest and fees, like everybody else this will be in effect, the grace period, that is denied to other city residents would you follow up and report on this for us?

MS. REED: The second submission is provided by Fay Franus as follows:

Council

Mr. Gaughgan please allow me to get through to you again. The zoom call to the public doesn't make it any more susceptible to a hacking anymore than what they do now when people zoom

into council meetings during the caucus or even during the regular meeting.

This is easily solved ---prior to the meeting people who want to zoom into the meeting to ask questions or comments simply e-mail council clerk Lori Reed and say they want to be zoomed in, then council can send ONLY THOSE that want to speak a link to be zoomed in. However you allow others that are zoomed in--whether it be a certain code --number or link.

That was a year ago that people got hacked. It has not happened since. Every week when people zoom in it is handled very well, no problems. I do believe the citizens of Scranton should have that same right and accessibility as any other person who gets to speak live at a council meeting.

Mr. Gaughan tonight I would like a response to this --a direct answer --Will you allow the people who want to ask questions of council to be zoomed in and if not why not. Your reply previously that people can e-mail council

and we have been doing this all along--that is not an answer.

Also how are we any different than any person you zoom in now? Explain how zooming those who are live during meetings any different than those of us who want to speak live. There actually is no difference. But I want to hear your thoughts on this.

If you say no that will only go to show you do not want the people to be able to speak/ live during a meting. Which is not a good sign at all.

15

I recently heard you mention a number of times how concerned you were Mr Gaughan about not wanting to go against the Administrative Code when you spoke about the police chief.

20

23

24

25

Well you are certainly not to concerned about the Administrative Code when it comes to the handling of the money coming in from the citizens who pay their garbage fee. The city has been using this money to pay other city

bills-- which has nothing to do with the running of the Department of Public Works. Ιn The City Administrative code it states this money collected from the citizens of Scranton for the garbage fee is only to be used to pay for the pickup of the garbage and all related items pertaining to the DPW. Nothing else. The city has been paying other city bills with this money for years.

10

12

13

14

15

Now I want to know tonight are you going to stop this practice if you care so much about not going against the Administrative code as you say you do. I'd also like a response to this tonight.

16

17

18

19

Another matter about your 2 A classification of the city. It was mentioned that there has been many legislative revisions to allow Scranton to stay 2 A.

21

20

I would like you to provide me with every one of those legislative revisions in writing. To me the law is the law. You should not be changing the law to help the city keep getting

22 23

24

25

more money in ways they would not be getting if they were not a 2A city.

It seems you are constantly following laws you want and ignoring those you don't want. I do not want to do a right to know-- You work for us. I would appreciate it if you would get those legislative revisions and I will gladly pick them up and pay for them.

I asked three questions tonight - since you read my letter before the meetings you have plenty of time to get me replies.

1. Zooming into meeting

2. Administrative code why are you using money to pay city bills from garbage fee money when it is only to be used for DPW matters. Are you going to stop this practice?

3. Will you please get me copies of any and all legislative revisions to keep Scranton a 2 A city?

22

23

(Concludes public comment letters as submitted to Council.)

24

25

MS. REED: And that is all.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you, Mrs. Reed.

On the question, anyone on the question? A

couple comments, for Miss deBarros, I don't

believe that if City employees owe back taxes

or refuse fees that they're charged like

everyone else.

There was a grace period for the refuse fee that Council passed but that was just to help people out generally due to the pandemic. But we'll followup on that.

MR. DONAHUE: Councilman Gaughan, just to add to that too, I know I did bring that when all that hit the paper about the employees owing about garnishing wages and I was told that that was not an option. It wasn't a legal option to take.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Great. Thank you. Mrs. Franus's questions we'll just check through these three. Number one, Zooming into the meeting. My answer to that is no. As I've stated before, the current setup of these meetings is going to continue until we can get back to Council chambers which I'm hopeful we can do within the next few months due to the

vaccinations, the max vaccinations that are going on.

And that seems to be improving as every day goes on. We're doing the absolute best that we can to conduct the business of the City. And that's of the utmost importance to me and I know to my fellow colleagues. We're here to conduct the business of the City.

Anyone who has any questions, anyone throughout the City could e-mail them to our City Clerk. We will read them as we just read Miss Franus's into the record and we will answer them as best we can. If we don't have an answer the night of the meeting we will get back to them with an answer if we can get one.

So the other point I want to make on that is we're fulfilling all of our duties, all of our duties under the Sunshine Act and actually going above and beyond what the Sunshine Act calls for. So the answer to that question is no. The answer to that is not going to change.

These meetings are run efficiently.

We are allowing for public comment. And that's the way it's going to be until we get back into

the Council Chambers, which I hope is soon.

Number two, on the Administrative

Code, why is the City using money to pay City
bills from garbage fee money? This has been
something that has come up before. That's
actually a function of the administration. And
there's also -- that question should go to the
Business Administrator and the Mayor.

And number two, the trash fee -- the whole trash fee issue is currently under litigation. And I think that issue is part of that. So I'm not going to comment on that.

And number three, will I please get copies of any and all legislative revision to keep Scranton a 2A city. I'm not going to do that either. So the answer to that is no.

Those revisions would come from the state. So Miss Franus could contact her state representative for that information.

That wouldn't be housed I don't think in our office. Anyone else on the question? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.

MR. MCANDREW: Aye.

1 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The 2 3 ayes have it and so moved. 4 MS. REED: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A. MOTIONS. 5 MR. GAUGHAN: Councilman Schuster, 6 7 any motions or comments tonight? 8 MR. SCHUSTER: I do have some 9 I'm going to make them on the comments. question though in Fifth Order. 10 Thank you. Councilman 11 MR. GAUGHAN: 12 McAndrew, any motions or comments? I do. So I've been 13 MR. MCANDREW: 14 bringing up this situation over here on Main Avenue in West Side. So we all got an e-mail. 15 16 And it addressed a piece of it. There's two 17 pieces that I think we need to circle around 18 and maybe go back. 19 And I want to thank Mrs. Cipriani 20 for, you know, updating us and she's, you know, 21 for the most part it says vehicles no longer 22 block an alley at 1218 Main Street. And that's 23 the Luxury Auto. But the issue with the 24 service garage -- there's a little confusion.

So the alley you're referring to is

25

the alley next to the service garage with no name which is 1350. All right. That's where there's more problems. So there's two pieces here. The car dealership which like I said there's a hundred cars and there should be five.

So my question still lies where -- are two entities violating just parking? I'm not even saying off-street parking. That's a problem. Residents don't own the parking spots. But the amount of cars that are at these two business is beyond ridiculous.

Like, I never seen anything like it.

So I think, you know, maybe I wasn't clear enough. I'm trying to be clear now that the issues have not been resolved or addressed.

Maybe they're allowed that many cars. I just need to know that.

And are these cars that are overflowing in front the neighbors' houses with all these different plates from all over the country, they are not residents there. But these two places -- that same owner are parking at the garage in the neighborhood and parking off the car lot.

Between the two is probably 200 cars so maybe, Mrs. Reed, if you could just maybe redirect my question, clarify if you'd like.

I'll try to explain it better in an e-mail to you tomorrow so you could forward it on. That is all I have. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you, Councilman McAndrew. Councilman Donahue, any motions or comments?

MR. DONAHUE: I have nothing at this time.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. I have a few. I mentioned this in Third Order. I'm just going to mention it again. Mrs. Reed, if you could find out why we're -- you know, what the deal is in the Law Department with overtime.

Again, it just boggles my mind that for some reason this administration feels that even though the line item has a big fat zero in it that they could continue to spend overtime in the Law Department. Who is getting overtime in the Law Department?

As I said in Third Order, I went from 2015 to 2019, no money budgeted for

overtime in the Law Department, no money spent.

So why all of a sudden are we spending overtime in the Law Department?

Same thing with DPW administration.

There's money budgeted. There's money -- we're over budget by \$200 as I mentioned earlier.

I'm assuming it's because of the snowstorm.

But I think we have to ask the question as to why all of a sudden supervisors are -- I'm assuming it's supervisors eligible for or getting overtime.

Again, as I mentioned earlier, I looked back at the previous budgets from 2015 to 2019, there was never any money, number one, budgeted and for the most part, never any money spent. So I'd just like to know if there is a new policy. If there is, what is it? Can we be provided with it?

And what has changed from the last five or so years when we weren't spending any money there. Number two, we received a document that will be in Third Order next week. I had asked for quite some time now. This spans two administrations just for an update on all of the Act 47 recommendations that are

located in our Recovery Plan.

I have been looking for an update on this like I said for at least four or five years and I could never get one for whatever reason. I want to thank the administration and Carl Deeley. They put together a very helpful document that clearly shows where we made progress and what is ongoing in terms of the recommendations.

And there's a lot of them. And as I mentioned before, some of them I think are crucial to achieve before we exit Act 47. Now, so that document will be coming or will be in Third Order next week for anyone who is interested.

And I know there have been some citizens in the past who have asked for that as well. We met again on Third Avenue, the issue out on Third Avenue with -- Councilman Donahue and I met with members of the administration. So there are some discussions going on there about the potential to somewhat alleviate that issue.

So hopefully within the next few weeks -- within the next two or three weeks

there will be more information coming on that hopefully in terms of legislation.

I received -- and I think I mentioned this last week an e-mail from a gentleman on the top of Ferdinand Street. He sent me pictures and videos of the fact that there are people up at the top of Ferdinand Street in North Scranton that have lost a day or two of work -- actually more than that because there's runoff from the top of Ferdinand Street.

And it literally encases the street in ice. I reached out to the DPW Director Mr. Preambo. He reached out to this gentleman and they're going to try to take care of that issue. But it is still ongoing. And it's a real shame because it's affecting a lot of people up there. So hopefully that gets taken care of as soon as possible.

I also wanted to just touch on the caucus that we had tonight. First with Tom McLane, I want to thank Tom McLane for coming in. He does a really wonderful job for the City of Scranton in terms of our park system.

I've said this many times here

before. Our parks in Scranton our are biggest assets. I live across the street from one.

And the fact that we're taking on this comprehensive park analysis is a huge benefit, huge benefit to the City.

And it shows foresight and forward thinking because as Mr. McLane said, we'll be able to pull the park study off the shelf and go right into the grant process rather than going through the motions that could take potentially months.

There are several parks throughout the City, one of them being Oakmont. And I've met with the neighbors up in that area at the park previously that needs a lot of TLC. So I'm hopeful that this comprehensive study is going to set us on track to over a period of time repairing and replacing some of the things in these parks making them the center point and the centerpiece for these neighborhoods throughout our City which I think is so important.

So again, I want to thank Mr. McLane and his company for their work on that and I'm looking forward to the final study. The second

thing I wanted to touch on is the caucus we had with representatives from MKDS and Eileen Cipriani our OECD Director and who else was there now I'm drawing a blank -- Bob Gattens the Recreation Authority Chairman and Paul Kelly the Solicitor.

There's an old saying that the time to fix the roof is when the sun is shining. I think that's applicable in this case. I'm a little disappointed that the Mayor and her administration knew that, you know, this -- the pool was an issue way back last year.

I don't think you could use the pandemic as an excuse. Last year would have been the perfect opportunity to at least start the ball rolling on this whole process. There was meetings. I was in the pool in the early summer and saw how bad it was.

I mentioned it at Council meetings.

I met with the Mayor and the Business

Administrator about it. And for some reason it took until late last year when we had to pass emergency legislation to get the study rolling.

And now we're up against a really tight timeline.

So again, I'm just disappointed. As Mr. Gattens said I do think -- we have to be honest. I do think that the City dropped the ball on this. In saying that, I do think there's huge opportunity here.

We're looking at a major challenge with all the issues that were outlined in this report. But I do think there is a major opportunity. Mr. Gattens mentioned Mayor Walsh from so many years ago that was kind of a pioneer in many respects in some of the things that he did.

And he made an investment in the park. He made investments in other parts of the City. Sometimes they were controversial and people didn't like that. But we could see the fruits of that decades later on what he was able to do.

So I think with the -- that the pool complex gets an opportunity for us to make an investment and an asset that we have. And I think we need to do it the right way. I don't think we could continue to put Band-Aids on the pool.

But I do think that we need to make

sure that it's done and it's done as quickly as possible. I'm looking forward to the end of the month when we'll receive more concrete figures on what the price tag is.

But based on the assessment -- and I think the cost was 1.6 million just to fix what's there and they're talking about potentially completely replacing the pool if we want to do it the right way. I think it's probably going to be much more than that based on what they said tonight.

I'm a little concerned about where we're going to get the funding for matching -- to match the grant, the DCNR grant. As I said to Mrs. Cipriani, I don't think we should put all of our eggs in one basket waiting for a grant.

We want to make sure this pool is open as soon as possible. I'm deeply disappointed that from what they said it can't be opened this summer. I think maybe there was the potential it could have been if we moved quicker when we knew this was an issue last year.

But at this point, that's neither

here nor there. I'm also concerned about -we're always concerned about the gorge. The
one thing I thought about today when I was
reading the report was if this pool is not open
will that push more people up to the gorge.

I know that they took some steps

last year to put security cameras up there.

Hopefully that continues to help the situation.

But I think that's a concern. The other

concern I have is with the pool -- with the

deep pool without a slide.

Every day that that goes not being filled in, I think exposes young people that are up there -- anyone who's up there that anybody hops that fence and falls in it's a 13 or 14-foot drop. So I'm looking forward to that being filled in and taken care of as Mrs. Cipriani mentioned.

As I mentioned during the caucus, I think we need to look at not just grants, I think we need to look at potential borrowing whether there's something that we could do with the Recreation Authority to go out and to potentially borrow these funds to fast track this project looking maybe at the capital

budget and reallocating there if that's a possibility.

Or one of the ideas I had earlier today was potentially using some proceeds from the refinancing if that's a possibility adding a capital component to the refinancing. The interest rates as everybody knows are really low right now. So if you could refinance and get a rate that comparable, it might be better to do that than to borrow the money.

So again, I think challenge, disappointment but chance for an opportunity here to make a huge difference there, to do it the right way and then 40 to 50 years from now we'll still have a pool that's operational and that's not cracking and leaking everywhere.

So I'm looking forward to continued conversations and discussions with the administration. And that's all I have. Mrs. Reed?

MS. REED: Thank you. 5-B. FOR

INTRODUCTION - AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF

THE COUNCIL NO. 8, 1987, AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED

"AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 87, 1976

ENTITLED AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED 'PROVIDING

FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF A LICENSE FOR ALL PERFORMERS, ENTERTAINERS, SPORTING TEAMS, MUSICAL GROUPS, BANDS, THEATRICAL CAST, DANCING GROUPS, RECITAL GROUPS, PAID LECTURERS AND SPEAKERS BY INCREASING FEES"'TO DECREASE THE FEES DUE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC.

MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-B be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. DONAHUE: So moved.

MR. SCHUSTER: Second.

MR. GAUGHAN: On the question?

MR. MCANDREW: I'd just like to say that I'm glad to see there's some relief. I know we've talked about for a few weeks. Billy or Mr. Gaughan, you brought it up initially. I'm glad that, you know, we came to a little consensus here with the City, you know, to reduces these fees. And I'm glad and happy to vote on this all the way through.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Anyone else on the question? I agree, Mark. This was an idea that I had after speaking to a local business owner that's actually in my neighborhood who mentioned it to me.

And I think it makes it more affordable, more economical, especially with the pandemic and the fact that our small business owners are facing an uphill battle. And many of them are not available to have entertainment like they usually would. And that's where they make some of their money.

So hopefully this -- it's not going to solve everything. But hopefully it allows them to bear the burden a little bit more.

Anyone else? All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.

MR. MCANDREW: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved.

MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION —
AN ORDINANCE — AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL
NO. 70, 2016, AN ORDINANCE, "AUTHORIZING THE
CREATION OF AN EVENT LICENSE TO ALLEVIATE THE
DIRECT EXPENSE TO PEDDLERS AND TO ALLOW A MORE
EFFICIENT OPERATION OF VARIOUS EVENTS IN THE
CITY, AND IMPOSING AN EVENT LICENSE FEE
SCHEDULE" TO DECREASE THE FEES DUE TO THE

COVID-19 PANDEMIC. 1 MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll 2 3 entertain a motion that Item 5-C be introduced 4 into its proper committee. 5 MR. DONAHUE: So moved. MR. SCHUSTER: Second. 6 MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? 7 A11 8 those in favor of introduction signify by 9 saying aye. MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. 10 11 MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 12 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 13 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The 14 ayes have it and so moved. MS. REED: 5-D. FOR INTRODUCTION -15 AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL 16 17 NO. 33, 2013, AN ORDINANCE, "AMENDING SECTIONS 18 340-1, 340-8, 340-9 AND 340-13(A) OF THE CODE 19 OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON GOVERNING PEDDLING AND 20 SOLICITING WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON" 21 BY FURTHER AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 340-13(A) TO DECREASE THE FEE BY 20% 22 23 DUE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC. 24 MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll 25 entertain a motion that Item 5-D be introduced

	•
1	into its proper committee.
2	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
3	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
4	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
5	those in favor of introduction signify by
6	saying aye.
7	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
8	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
9	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
10	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
11	ayes have it and so moved.
12	MS. REED: 5-E. FOR INTRODUCTION -
13	A RESOLUTION - APPROVING A SPONSORSHIP
14	AGREEMENT WITH THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF
15	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION FOR THE MEADOW BROOK
16	FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT.
17	MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll
18	entertain a motion that Item 5-E be introduced
19	into its proper committee.
20	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
21	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
22	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question?
23	MR. SCHUSTER: On the question, so
24	while this is in Fifth Order, I wanted to get
25	the conversation started. I'm very glad to

hear this project is happening. It's been a very long time. And with that said, this project here is going to take several years. And in the time that's it's going to take, I think some of the neighbors there are looking for some kind of temporary fix for their backyards. So I'd like to ask Mrs. Reed and the Council for support on this.

But maybe we'll get a letter sent over to the administration about finding some kind of temporary fix as the spring and summer months are coming for these neighbors whether it be bringing in some dirt or planting some grass, something like that to alleviate maybe the eyesore in their yards.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Anyone else on the question? Just two things, first of all, this is a final fix to this issue that has been plaguing this area of the City for decades. We need to vote on this agreement to lay out the responsibilities for both the City and DEP.

One of the City's responsibilities and we'll hear from Don King and Joe O'Brien next week would be to take the right of ways,

negotiate them, get clear title to the land, things like that. So there's a lot that goes into this project even before a shovel can hit the ground.

But this -- it's going to be a longer process than I know most people would like. This is the first step to make sure that this is fixed and fixed for good. So I'm looking forward to voting on this and putting this issue to bed eventually once and for all and helping the neighbors up there with their unbelievable situations that they've had to go through.

I've talked to many of them, Al Young and his wife. It's a shame what's happened but this is the ultimate fix.

Anyone else? All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.

MR. MCANDREW: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved.

MS. REED: 5-F. FOR INTRODUCTION A RESOLUTION - ACCEPTING A DONATION

	8
1	PRESENTED TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON FIRE
2	DEPARTMENT FROM THE CLIFFORD TOWNSHIP VOLUNTEER
3	FIRE COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$100.00 IN MEMORY
4	OF SCRANTON FIREFIGHTER STEPHEN SUNDAY.
5	MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll
6	entertain a motion that Item 5-F be introduced
7	into its proper committee.
8	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
9	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
10	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
11	those in favor signify of introduction by
12	saying aye.
13	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
14	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
15	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
16	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
17	ayes have it and so moved.
18	MS. REED: 5-G. FOR INTRODUCTION -
19	A RESOLUTION - ACCEPTING A DONATION
20	PRESENTED TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON FIRE
21	DEPARTMENT FROM TOM HESSER CHEVROLET/BMW IN THE
22	AMOUNT OF \$1,514.00.
23	MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll
24	entertain a motion that Item 5-G be introduced
25	into its proper committee.
	II

1	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
2	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
3	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
4	those in favor of introduction signify by
5	saying aye.
6	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
7	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
8	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
9	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
10	ayes have it and so moved.
11	MS. REED: 5-H. FOR INTRODUCTION -
12	A RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND
13	OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
14	ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE RE-BID SIMULATOR
15	AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT BETWEEN THE CITY OF
16	SCRANTON AND SEAN BYRNE CONSTRUCTION FOR
17	GENERAL CONTRACTING WORK.
18	MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll
19	entertain a motion that Item 5-H be introduced
20	into its proper committee.
21	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
22	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
23	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? On
24	the question, we're going to insert next week
25	or Lori will send out the legislative cover

sheet which was mistakenly excluded from this piece of legislation. So that does just give an overview of what this project entails.

And then next week members -representatives of the administration are going
to come to caucus and do a run through of this
whole project at the Serrenti Center.

But the long and short of it is that they're going to install a public safety simulator that simulates the use of force, crisis management, de-escalation and tactical judgment training. So this contract covers the construction and renovation of the space that's going to house the training simulator.

And I think the ultimate goal is to extend this to other communities, other police departments around our area so that they could use it and it could be a revenue generator eventually. So we'll get more information about that next week. Anyone else on the question? All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.

MR. MCANDREW: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

1	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
2	ayes have it and so moved.
3	MS. REED: 5-I. FOR INTRODUCTION -
4	A RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND
5	OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
6	ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE RE-BID SIMULATOR
7	AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT BETWEEN THE CITY OF
8	SCRANTON AND LEBER ELECTRIC, INC. FOR THE
9	ELECTRICAL WORK.
10	MR. GAUGHAN: At this time I'll
11	entertain a motion that Item 5-I be introduced
12	into its proper committee.
13	MR. DONAHUE: So moved.
14	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
15	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
16	those in favor of introduction signify by
17	saying aye.
18	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
19	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
20	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
21	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
22	ayes have it and so moved.
23	MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A.
24	READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 54,
25	2021 - AN ORDINANCE - ESTABLISHING A "NO

1	PARKING" ZONE ALONG THE EASTERLY SIDE OF
2	WYOMING AVENUE (S.R.3025) FROM SEGMENT 0000
3	OFFSET 1292 TO SEGMENT 0020 OFFSET 1417 TO
4	ALLOW FOR SAFE SIGHT DISTANCES FOR A PARKING
5	LOT PROPOSED BY MILLER LOFTS LOCATED AT 620
6	WYOMING AVENUE.
7	MR. GAUGHAN: You've heard reading
8	by title of Item 6-A. What is your pleasure?
9	MR. DONAHUE: I move that Item 6-A
10	pass reading by title.
11	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
12	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
13	those in favor signify by saying aye.
14	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
15	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
16	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
17	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
18	ayes have it and so moved.
19	MS. REED: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -
20	FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 55, 2021 - AN
21	ORDINANCE - ESTABLISHING A "NO PARKING ZONE"
22	ALONG THE WESTERLY SIDE OF THE 800 BLOCK OF
23	WYOMING AVENUE FROM NEW STREET SOUTH
24	TO WEST GIBSON STREET AND PLACEMENT OF THE
25	FOLLOWING SIGNS: FOUR (4) R8-3 NO PARKING

NC PA

SYMBOL SIGNS 12"X12", THREE (3) R-301

NO PARKING ARROW PLAQUE AND ONE (1) R-301 NO

PARKING LEFT ARROW PLAQUE.

MR. DONAHUE: I make a motion to correct an error as found in Item 6-B. The No Parking Zone along the 800 block of Wyoming Avenue references "West" Gibson Street; however, the correct location is "East" Gibson Street. There are four (4) references to "West" as follows: 1.) In the summary title; 2.) In the second Whereas clause; 3.) In the third Whereas clause; and 4.) In the Now, Therefore clause, that should be amended to reflect "East."

MR. SCHUSTER: Second.

MR. GAUGHAN: There's a motion on the floor and a second to correct the directional location from West to East, as incorrectly cited in Item 6-B. On the question? I'm sure all the neighbors on West Gibson Street are thrilled with the correction. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.

MR. MCANDREW: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

1	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
2	ayes have it and so moved.
3	You've heard reading by title of
4	Item 6-B. What is your pleasure?
5	MR. DONAHUE: I move that Item 6-B
6	as amended pass reading by title.
7	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
8	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? All
9	those in favor signify by saying aye.
10	MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.
11	MR. MCANDREW: Aye.
12	MR. DONAHUE: Aye.
13	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The
14	ayes have it and so moved.
15	MS. REED: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR
16	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR
17	ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 50, 2021 -
18	AMENDING SECTION 709.G OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON
19	ZONING ORDINANCE PROHIBITING SIGNS OR
20	DISPLAYS THAT INCLUDE WORDS OR IMAGES THAT ARE
21	OBSCENE, PORNOGRAPHIC, OR THAT AN AVERAGE
22	REASONABLE PERSON WOULD FIND HIGHLY OFFENSIVE
23	TO PUBLIC DECENCY.
24	MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the
25	Committee on Rules, I recommend final passage

1 of Item 7-A. 2 MR. DONAHUE: Second. 3 MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? 4 MR. SCHUSTER: On the question, 5 Kevin, can you just give a -- just a final review of the change? We talked about the open 6 7 language was what caused the issue with this 8 ordinance. But we still have the ability to 9 enforce anything obscene, correct? 10 ATTY. HAYES: That's correct. The 11 only thing we're removing is the subjective 12 language that states or that an average 13 reasonable person would find highly offensive 14 to public decency. 15 We still have available the right to 16 prohibit pornographic or other highly explicit 17 So that's the only thing that's being signage. 18 removed. The remaining sections -- the 19 remaining portions of Section 609 and 610 20 remain in place. 21 MR. SCHUSTER: Thank you. 22 ATTY. HAYES: No problem. 23 MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else on the 24 question? 25 MR. MCANDREW: Yes, on the question,

it feels like I've been voting on this for two months. Like, guess what, the more people -- the longer we take for the final vote the more people I hear that have a problem with this.

And I understand like I said, first of all, I'm not against -- I'm all for free speech and self expression. All right. But the problem I have with this is we're changing language for this ordinance. We're changing language because of language and now to allow language.

All right, I still can't wrap my head around this because -- and I understand we tried to enforce it. And we were threatened with a lawsuit. So we said let's change the language. That's problem I have. We got to fight once in a while.

And I have another -- so like I said, I've talked to people in the community and they still have a problem with that -- the Hispanic community over there. I mean, I just had a grandson. And what if I take a walk over in south side two years from now and I'm walking down past this restaurant and at that inquisitive age my grandson says what does that

mean? What does that word mean?

Do I tell him or not tell him? It means the "F" word. It's clearly been explained to me by everybody, Hispanic community. And I understand that, you know, the owner says it's an inside joke. With who? With his community?

Who is the joke on? Is the joke on the south side residents? Is the joke on me? Or is the joke on all of you. So like I said, my vote is one of principle. I think allowing this moving forward we open a can of worms, a number 10 can of worms that signs -- we're going to have issues with signs down the road. So for that like I stated a while now I'm a no. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: I'm going to vote for this because I understand what Councilman McAndrew is saying. But my concern is that the joke is going to be on all of us if we all voted against this because the only people who will be laughing all the way to bank would be the lawyers from the ACLU and other attorneys who would make out on this just like the case that went -- I think it was Colts was involved

in some sort of case and they lost.

And based on the opinion that was provided by Solicitor O'Brien and confirmed by Solicitor Hayes if we were to all vote against this, we would most likely lose in court. And we would owe probably a substantial amount of money.

So that's my concern on voting for it. The law I think is clear on it. And if we don't change it, you know, we're up a creek without a paddle.

ATTY. HAYES: Mr. President. I just want to provide clarification. We will still have on the books an ordinance which reads as follows: The following signs are prohibited in all zoning districts signs or displays that include words or images that are obscene or pornographic.

So we're not removing that language. The only thing we're removing is that language which would permit us to make subjective determinations of what's offensive which I've reviewed and would be whether we like it or not, the appellate courts of the country -- several different circuits have determined that

that type of restriction is a violation of the First Amendment.

MR. GAUGHAN: So it's safe to say that the City would be exposed here and we most likely end up being -- we'd be on the wrong side of the issue.

ATTY. HAYES: That's correct with that language. Right or wrong if we tried to enforce that language, I think we would be -- it would be overturned. And like you said earlier, to the benefit of the civil rights lawyer who brought the claim.

MR. DONAHUE: Kevin, just a quick followup question on that. Is there a strict definition of what's considered obscene?

ATTY. HAYES: In our -- hold on one second here.

MR. GAUGHAN: You're not pulling up any pictures or anything, are you? This Zoom meeting would get really interesting. I want to make sure we adjourn soon.

ATTY. HAYES: Hold on one second here. I don't think we have any -- I don't believe the code has a specific definition of obscene. But they have a definition of obscene

1	material. Let me pull it up here. Hold on one		
2	second. You know, there's a definition		
3	provided of obscene materials that probably		
4	would be used for purposes of applying it to		
5	the statute.		
6	MR. DONAHUE: Okay.		
7	MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else on the		
8	question? Roll call, please.		
9	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.		
10	MR. SCHUSTER: Yes.		
11	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew.		
12	MR. MCANDREW: No.		
13	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.		
14	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.		
15	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.		
16	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. I hereby declare		
17	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.		
18	MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION		
19	BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT -		
20	FOR ADOPTION - RESOLUTION NO. 133, 2021 -		
21	AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE		
22	OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO		
23	ADOPT THE CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR THE		
24	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.		
25	MR. GAUGHAN: What is the		

1	recommendation of the Chairperson for the
2	Committee on Community Development?
3	MR. DONAHUE: As the temporary
4	Chairperson for the Committee on Community
5	Development, I recommend final passage of Item
6	7 - B .
7	MR. SCHUSTER: Second.
8	MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? Roll
9	call, please.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster.
11	MR. SCHUSTER: Yes.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McAndrew.
13	MR. MCANDREW: Yes.
14	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.
15	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
16	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
17	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. I hereby declare
18	Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted.
19	MS. REED: 7-C. FOR CONSIDERATION
20	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
21	RESOLUTION NO. 134, 2021 - APPOINTMENT OF
22	LEONARD NAMIOTKA, 1130 PHILO STREET, SCRANTON,
23	PENNSYLVANIA, 18508, TO THE POSITION OF
24	SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE FOR THE CITY OF
25	SCRANTON EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 17, 2021.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the Committee on Rules, I recommend final passage of Item 7-C.

MR. DONAHUE: Second.

MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? On the question, I'm going to make a motion at this time to table Item 7-C.

MR. DONAHUE: Second.

MR. GAUGHAN: On the question? 0n the question, I'm making this motion to table Number one, this will be in for a few reasons. Third Order next week for the public to take a look at. But the Mayor did respond to our letter last week that the -- stated our basic concern which was that the Administrative Code states very clearly that when you make a -someone -- when you appoint them in an acting capacity, you have 35 days to either send that legislation to Council so we could officially accept that appointment and make them permanent or, you know, you have to move onto somebody else.

And there is other language in there as well that we cited in our letter. So we had a few questions for Mayor Cognetti on this.

And just for the record, we've been asking these questions for a while now. And we could never get an answer. So the Mayor sent us a response and didn't really in my opinion answer any of our concerns or any of our questions.

It talked about turmoil in the country last summer and other things that really had nothing to do with in my opinion what we were asking which is very simply regarding the Administrative Code.

So until we get a better explanation, I can't in good conscience move forward on this. As Councilman McAndrew and others stated last week, this is nothing to do with Chief Namiotka. I would be more than happy to approve this with no issues.

But we need to make sure that we're following the rules here. The Mayor can't just make up her own rules as she goes along. The code clearly states 35 days and whether or not the Mayor likes that is neither here nor there. It doesn't matter if I like it. It's 35 days.

That's what every other Mayor and every other administration has had to go by since the Administrative Code and that section

was put into place. So I'm still unclear where we're coming up or where they're coming up with the term interim. I'm still unclear on why it took that long.

And I don't want to vote in the affirmative and expose ourselves if this is not the legally correct thing to do. So that's why I'm making the motion to table. Anyone else on the question?

MR. DONAHUE: I would just like to add to that, you know, former Chief Graziano resigned about seven months ago I think to the date. I think it was around the middle of August. So I understand that, you know, 35 days might not be enough.

But there was also an additional 30 days from the time that the Chief announced his resignation until, you know, that resignation took into effect. So that essentially becomes 65 days. And then also on that too is there's, you know, the weird part about the CBA with the police department is it clearly states in the CBA that the Chief has to come from the bargaining unit.

So it's not like, you know, you have

to go out and do this national search. You know, your pool is a little lower. So I would just like to make those two points too.

MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else on the question?

MR. MCANDREW: Yeah, I just have one quick thing. So everybody knows where I'm at with this. And it's nothing personal like I said. Now that even brings it more than 150 days. It's almost a school year, 180.

But I was very skeptical from the beginning when I saw interim instead of acting. I brought it up a couple of times. No one seemed to have the answer. I think it's tactical because that's -- looks like it's a part of the defense now going past 35.

So I'd like clarity on that once and for all what do these two words mean. They mean the same to me. Also what -- now, I heard something else brought to my attention. What's the 90 day rule? Okay, we know the 35 day rule. That's cut and dry.

Thirty-five days you have to appoint. What's the 90-day rule for a police officer who is in a position or say acting or

whatever that automatically becomes theirs, that position. Solicitor Hayes, can you just look at that for me?

ATTY. HAYES: Sure.

MR. MCANDREW: I have nothing in front of me. It was something that was brought to my attention. But supposedly within the police union there is a 90-day rule. All right. Can you explore that before we vote on this for final passage?

ATTY. HAYES: Sure.

MR. MCANDREW: Or whatever we're doing with it. Maybe it's something we need to look at also. Thank you.

ATTY. HAYES: Okay.

MR. GAUGHAN: And again, I want to make the point too that I don't think Council is trying to be difficult here. Usually these appointments are very routine. And we usually approve when we see someone's resume and we give our approval.

But, you know, it raises a red flag with me when you ask the question and they just kind of blow you off and don't give you an answer. I've been down that road before and

I've asked it. I've raised it with the Mayor. 1 We raised it with her pubically in a caucus and 2 3 were told it's a personnel issue which -- it's 4 an Administrative Code issue. It's not a personnel issue. 5 So again, I just want to make sure we're following 6 7 the rules. That's all. Anyone else? 8 MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, I mean, the 9 last thing I'd like to say is I think each one 10 of us here has said, you now, this is a process 11 issue. We asked the question. We didn't get 12 any answers. And it's something we brought up 13 for a long time now. So nothing to do with the 14 individual that this is involving but 15 everything to do with process. 16 MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else? A11 17 those in favor of the motion to table agenda 18 Item 7-C signify by saying aye. 19 MR. SCHUSTER: Aye. 20 MR. MCANDREW: Aye. 21 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. MR. GAUGHAN: 22 Aye. Opposed? The 23 ayes have it and agenda Item 7-C is tabled. 24 MS. REED: EIGHTH ORDER. 01d 25 Business. RESOLUTION NO. 120, 2021 -

ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURE REVIEW BOARD ("HARB") AND DENYING THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR L. R. COSTANZO CO., INC., 123 NORTH MAIN AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA 18504 FOR THE FOLLOWING UPGRADES TO SITE LIGHTING THROUGHOUT THE PROPERTY AT PNC BANK, 201 PENN AVENUE, SCRANTON, PA 18503.

MR. GAUGHAN: This piece of legislation is currently tabled as Mrs. Reed mentioned. Next week March 16th there's going to be a public hearing held at 5:45 p.m., on this piece of legislation.

Next week I'll also entertain a motion to place it in Seventh Order for a final vote. If anyone wishes to speak on this resolution or provide comment for the public hearing, you may do so by e-mailing Lreed@scrantonpa.gov or by U.S. mail at Scranton Municipal Building, 340 North Washington Avenue, Scranton, PA 18503, attention City Clerk's office by 3 p.m., next Tuesday, March 16th. If there is no further business, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. DONAHUE: Motion to adjourn.

ı		
		102
1	MR. GAUGHAN: This meeting is	
2	adjourned. Thanks everyone. See you next	
3	week.	
4	MR. DONAHUE: Thank you.	
5	MR. MCANDREW: Good night.	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

$\mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{E} \; \mathsf{R} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{F} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{A} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{E}$

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me of the above-cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

Maria McCool, RPR

Official Court Reporter

(The foregoing certificate of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.)